



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/662,188

09/15/2003

Jonathan A. Schmitt

03-0981/L13.12-041

9375

7590

04/25/2005

Leo J. Peters
LSI Logic Corporation
1621 Barber Lane, MS D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

MIS, DAVID C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,188

Applicant(s)

SCHMITT ET AL.

Examiner

David Mis

Art Unit

2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 9-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 and 14-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the reference characters are handwritten and difficult to read, there are characters that are too small to read, the lines are irregular and the background is not clean. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 8, "metallization pattern metallization pattern" is redundant. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

4. Claims 1 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f.) as being clearly anticipated by Vasishta et al.

Vasishta et al disclosed the method for designing the circuit of the present application and said in column 4, lines 34-40 that "... elements which are common to all designs (I/O connections, PLL forms, etc.) ..." which shows that Vasishta et al knew of using the method for PLL's. Vasishta et al disclosed an integrated circuit with a PLL and a plurality of subcells (column 10, lines 11-13); "... one or more metal layers formed over and interconnecting ..." (column 10, lines 22-24); wherein changing elements of PLL's inevitably changed the PLL output frequency range; and not changing the base layer or metallization for an element in two configurations indicates that the element is not the changed element.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 2 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e.) as being clearly anticipated by Eltoukhy.

Eltoukhy disclosed an integrated circuit with a PLL with resistive subcells arranged on the bottom and variable metallization above (abstract). Each region of resistive material corresponds to a subcell; that is, two subcells comprise some of the same resistive region. So, each variable resistor in the IC PLL formed a plurality of subcells. Variable resistors appeared in the loop filter (Figure 3), charge pump current mirror (Figure 4), voltage reference (Figure 5) and VCO (figure 6) thus varying the frequency range of the PLL. Each of the variable resistor subcells in the VCO was a VCO subcell. If a subcell base layer pattern and metallization pattern (or a plurality of them in a PLL element such as the Phase Detector, Filter ...) did not change between configurations, then the subcell (or PLL element) was not reconfigured; and another subcell (or PLL element) that has a different base layer pattern and / or a different metallization pattern between the two configurations was reconfigured. Not all of them must be reconfigured. A first and second plurality of subcells may be the same resistor.

6. Claims 3-8 and 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Mis whose telephone number is (571)272-1765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571)272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Mis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2817